



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,163	05/30/2000	Wido Menhardt	48906.2USPT	2456

24238 7590 09/29/2003

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1401 McKinney
SUITE 2700
HOUSTON, TX 77010-4034

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,163

Applicant(s)

MENHARDT ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

In the Abstract, "means" are found in lines 3, 4, 5, and 6. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weinberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962).

As to claim 1, Weinberg teaches a framework for an application comprising:

- a. a process consisting of a set of activities (col. 8 lines 32-50 and figs 1-3);

Art Unit: 2174

b. a sub-process comprising an aggregation of said activities (sub-views, col. 10 lines 1-9);

c. one or more activities (col. 10 lines 16-33).

As to claim 4, Weinberg teaches a framework for monitoring workflow within an application having multiple levels of functionality, said framework capable of combining a plurality of components from different sources, the framework comprising:

a. a process level for selecting a set of defined process steps to be applied to a data set associated with a set of activities (col. 8 lines 32-50 and figs 1-3);

b. a sub-process level including an aggregation of selected activities from said set of activities, said sub-process level for facilitating navigation between ones of said selected activities (col. 10 lines 1-9); and

c. an activity level including at least one activity from said set of activities; wherein said at least one activity having a property in said data set that is modified as a result of the applied processing of said activity level to produce an output data set (col. 10 lines 16-33).

As to claim 5, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 4 further comprising a user interface for facilitating interaction between a user and said application (GUI, col. 9 line 63-col. 10 line 9).

As to claim 6, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 5, wherein the levels are assignable to distinct regions of said user interface (figs. 1-3).

As to claim 7, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 6, wherein said activity level further supports a re-use of a previous activity over a current activity, said previous activity selected from said aggregation of selected activities (col. 9 lines 18).

As to claim 8, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 5, wherein said user interface includes a screen for providing a display of images (col. 8 lines 32-50 and figs. 1-3).

As to claim 9, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 8, wherein a current activity being processed from said set of activities is assigned to a work area of said screen, said work area having a substantial portion of the screen surface area (figs. 19, and 21-22).

As to claim 10, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 9, wherein said framework monitors ownership of said work area by said current activity (the navigation paths taken by specific users, col. 3 lines 8-30).

As to claim 11, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 6, wherein said user interface facilitates multiple activities that are processable concurrently (updated, col. 3 lines 44-64).

As to claim 12, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 4, wherein said sub-process level facilitates a dynamic ordering of said selected activities by said user (col. 10 lines 1-15).

As to claim 13, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 4, wherein said process level automates a control flow between said selected activities in said set of activities based on a rule set or an activity property set (automatically scanning and mapping, col. 3 lines 31-63).

As to claim 14, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 4, wherein at least two of said different sources have different formats (col. 8 lines 46-50).

As to claim 15, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 4, wherein said process level monitors functionality of a current activity based on said output data set obtained from a previous activity (figs. 5 and 14).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 16, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 4, wherein said process level includes a data selector for selecting said data set (activity levels, col. 7 line 55-col. 8 line 8).

As to claim 17, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 16, wherein said process level further includes a process selector for selecting said set of defined process steps compatible with said data set (retrieve a URL, col. 10 lines 16-34).

As to claim 18, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 4, wherein said process level facilitates selection between active activities by a user (predetermined size threshold, col. 8 lines 53-56).

As to claim 19, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 4 further comprising a tool level for setting a parameter of said activity level, said parameter for updating an operational behaviour of said activity level (behavior pattern, col. 8 lines 1-8).

As to claim 20, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 19, wherein said tool level is assignable to a distinct region of a user interface, said user interface for facilitating interaction between a user and said application (distances for spacing, col. 13 lines 18-50).

As to claim 21, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 20, wherein said framework coordinates installation of a tool in the tool level region of said interface, said tool requested by said activity level (Astra is installed in a client computer, col. 17 lines 54-67).

As to claim 22, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 19, wherein said tool level includes a tool navigator for facilitating selection of a tool by said user (elements 37, and 71-73 of fig. 1).

As to claim 23, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 19, wherein multiple tool levels are supported by said framework (fig. 21).

As to claim 24, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 9, wherein a content of said work area contains shared properties stored in a shared data context (API share data, col. 7 lines 17-22).

As to claim 25, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 24, wherein said shared data context is accessible by cooperating ones of said selected activities for sharing information (grouping and access, col. 19 lines 57-60).

As to claim 26, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 24, wherein said data set and said set of process steps form a basis of said shared data context (share data, col. 7 lines 17-22).

As to claim 27, Weinberg teaches framework according to claim 24, wherein the content of said shared data context is accessible by said user for verifying that required data for said selected activities is present (default mode, col. 21 lines 30-36).

As to claim 28, Weinberg teaches framework according to claims 4, wherein said framework restricts access by said user of selected ones of the levels (to display only certain types of information, col. 30 lines 10-26).

As to claim 29, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 4 further including a module for interfacing said application to a database library (database query, col. 9 lines 19-36).

As to claim 30, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 29, wherein said data base library includes data selected from the group comprising process definitions, sub-process

Art Unit: 2174

descriptions, and activity information (recently accessed URL to the current URL, col. 29 line 22-col. 30 line 26).

As to claim 31, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 29, wherein said data set is external to said framework with an interface to said data set provided by said module (information via a network connection, col. 2 lines 10-26).

As to claim 32, Weinberg teaches a framework according to claim 19, wherein said framework restricts access by said user of selected ones of the levels (specify specific time and date ranges to monitor, col. 30 lines 16-26).

As to claims 33-51, they are method claims of product claims 4-6, 8-16, 7, 19-20, 30, 24-25, 28 and 32. Note the rejections of claims 4-6, 8-16, 7, 19-20, 30, 24-25, 28 and 32 above respectively.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,977,972) teach hierarchy, web browser, links, navigations, tools, directions, and mapping (cols. 3-40 and figs. 1-38).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong

09/05/03



STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER